

**CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND**  
**(Adopted 4/11/05)**

**PRESENTATION, INTERVIEWS, SPECIAL SESSION,  
WORKSESSION & CLOSED SESSION  
OF THE CITY COUNCIL**

**Monday, June 14, 2004**

**OFFICIALS PRESENT:**

Mayor Porter	Deputy City Manager Hobbs
Councilmember Austin-Lane	City Clerk Waters
Councilmember Barry	Communications Director Moffet
Councilmember Elrich	Public Works Director Lott
Councilmember Mizeur	Public Works Deputy Director Braithwaite
Councilmember Williams	ECD Coordinator Daines
	Community & Government Liaison Ludlow

**OFFICIAL ABSENT:**

Councilmember Seamens

The City Council convened at 7:36 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building, 7500 Maple Avenue, Takoma Park, Maryland.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Ms. Porter welcomed Bill Gardiner, Mayor of Hyattsville, noting that our Council will have to visit one of his Council meetings.

Ms. Austin-Lane commented on the Council Procedures that were worked on by a sub-committee of the Council (Mayor Porter, Councilmember Williams, and herself). She was glad to see the agenda item on a July meeting agenda. The procedures would allow for a period of Council announcements at the beginning of each meeting. In Takoma, D.C. (Carroll/Maple), a developer has bought two parcels of land and proposes a commercial building. She noted a community meeting being held by the architect later this week. She encouraged the public to attend.

Ms. Mizeur said she is hosting a budget forum here on Wednesday at 7:30 p.m. She invited the public.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Nellie Moxley, President of PineCrest Association described an incident that took place over the weekend. There was a barbeque. They had trouble turning off a propane tank that caught on

fire. It took 20 minutes for contact to make it through the fire station re-routing process. Montgomery County is handling fire service, but we are not getting results. No one was hurt. We are paying taxes. There have been three home fires in the last seven weeks. We have had trouble in each instance getting proper response. We have had other agencies from the area come in response to a car explosion. The City Police were the last to arrive on the scene. We have had issues with ambulance calls; we are getting responses from D.C. versus the City. It is the same with some instances of police service. She is upset that it was not the Takoma Park Police Department on the scene, but does not think that it was the fault of the City. She remarked about an article that she provided input for in the newspaper.

Mr. Williams asked what type of phone she used for the calls to the fire department.

Ms. Moxley said it was her home phone and that she had dialed 911, as well as 311 (District).

Ms. Porter remarked that the City will follow-up with the County.

Ms. Austin-Lane requested clarification about the call to 311.

Ms. Porter explained that this is the District non-emergency line.

Mr. Williams will look into the case.

Dr. Alderman-Sween, New Hampshire Gardens Neighborhood Association expressed concern about commercial vans being parked in the residential neighborhoods. We have not been able to get information from the Police Department about regulations on commercial vehicles. The vans park for days at a time. They are obstructions to pedestrians, vehicles and sight lines. It is difficult, especially at night, to see around the vehicles. He commented on an incident of one being broken into. The owner did not live in the neighborhood. He is concerned this will start happening to residents' cars. A newsletter will be going out this week. He wants to indicate that the Council and police will address this issue. These parked commercial vehicles are creating parking issues (reducing availability) for residents. He remarked about Code Enforcement Officers in the City. He no longer sees them in the neighborhood. He cannot call and reach an enforcement officer. When a violation does occur, there is no mechanism for an officer to return the call to explain the resolution.

Ms. Porter said she will follow-up on the issues raised. She noted that some Code Enforcement has been turned over to the County.

Dr. Alderman-Sween said the commercial vehicles do not have signs on them, but they are clearly very large, unmarked commercial vans.

Mr. Barry congratulated her for election to President of the Association. He noted that Raju Charles is also an officer of the Association. He noted that there were six auto incidents in the past week (thefts/break-ins). He will be following up with the Chief.

Ms. Moxley said that in the location where the car was bombed, the street needs to be repaired. Eastern Avenue also looks terrible.

Mr. Williams said the street referenced (related to the car bombing) is Kansas.

## **PRESENTATION**

### **1. Community Center Construction Project.**

Mr. Williams remarked that a lot of the issues that have been holding up the progress of the contractor (e.g., unresolved questions), have been resolved. A lot of work is going on out front of the building. They are also now working between the building and the library. We probably have two large outstanding dollar items that need resolution. One is the electrical change order (on-going). The other deals with time associated with any delays. The other thing deals with getting a dollar amount with a reconfiguration of the main level. He displayed an architectural drawing of the building. He referred to the outside elements for the corners of the building (pre-cast concrete). It also shows a slight revision to some windows. It shows an elevation of the right side of the building. This depiction is for pricing purposes.

Ms. Porter asked about the triple windows being in the original design.

Both Ms. Mizeur and Mr. Williams replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Mizeur asked if we are facing any pending stop work dates at this point.

Mr. Williams replied in the negative.

## **ANNOUNCEMENT**

Ms. Austin-Lane said she was remiss in not announcing that Mr. Seamens will not be here this evening, but will be back next week.

## **INTERVIEWS**

**2. Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs (COLTA).** The Council interviewed Steve Wasser for reappointment to the commission.

**3. Facade Advisory Board - Sam Salyers.** The Council interviewed Sam Salyers for reappointment to the board.

**4. Free Burma Committee - Raju Charles.** The Council interviewed Raju Charles for reappointment to the committee.

**5. Nuclear-Free Takoma Park Committee - Adam Frank.** The Council interviewed Adam

Frank for reappointment to the committee.

## **SPECIAL SESSION**

### **6. 1<sup>st</sup> Reading Ordinance re: Facade Advisory Board.**

Ms. Porter explained the ordinance to eliminate the term limits for the member in the Historic Takoma representative's seat.

Moved by Mr. Elrich; seconded by Ms. Austin-Lane.

Ordinance #2004-20 was accepted unanimously at first reading (VOTING FOR: Porter, Austin-Lane, Barry, Elrich, Mizeur, Williams, ABSENT: Seamens).

### **ORDINANCE #2004-20 (Attached)**

### **7. Single Reading Ordinance re: Contract for Citizen Survey.**

Ms. Porter noted the ordinance. The Council had a presentation last week.

Ms. Ludlow said she had nothing to add to the information presented last week. She will make a correction to a typographical error in the ordinance. At this point, she would like to proceed. She asked the Council for ideas about some citizens to participate on the survey committee (renters and owners).

Moved by Mr. Elrich; seconded by Mr. Williams.

Mr. Barry suggested language to the effect that the survey should get at the prioritization of City services. This would be very useful information.

Ms. Ludlow said that has been part of the discussion of a number of people.

Ms. Porter clarified that there will be an open discussion about the content of the survey.

Ms. Austin-Lane asked whether this has been discussed with the new City Manager.

Ms. Ludlow replied in the affirmative. She was supportive as long as it was meaningful.

Andy Kelemen, Philadelphia Avenue recommended an additional "Whereas" clause and he read proposed additional language. No where in the ordinance is the level of the survey or its applicability to the Wards described. We spend a lot of money and time in every department with respect to outreach and communication. However, no dialogue is taking place. We are not getting information back from residents. While a survey is not dialogue, it is a step in the right

direction. If the survey is statistically valid, it establishes a baseline and is very important.

Ms. Ludlow said she does not mind adding that language. There was something in the RFP to this effect. The survey will have about a 6-7% variance versus a 5% (higher cost survey).

Ms. Porter asked if it will be comparable over time.

Ms. Ludlow said she will confirm.

Ms. Porter asserted that information at the Ward level is something that we are interested in, (agreeing with Mr. Kelemen). She also agrees with Ms. Ludlow about not wanting to spend an incredible amount more for a small percent variable reduction.

Moved by Ms. Austin-Lane; seconded by Mr. Elrich (with acceptance of the proposed language).

Ms. Austin-Lane said she is not sure what is meant by the 6-7% variance. We need a strong response (70%) and a large enough sample size for it to be valid.

Ms. Ludlow said she can show statistics for how that will work. 3,000 surveys will be sent out. The likelihood is about a 40% return rate which is thought to be adequate to get input from renters and home owners. She will be happy to discuss it with Ms. Austin-Lane.

Mr. Elrich asked if more than half of the surveys are going to renters.

Ms. Ludlow replied in the affirmative. They will be over sampled.

Mr. Elrich questioned are there any steps in the contract to make sure that we get adequate returns.

Ms. Ludlow replied in the affirmative. They will go back as needed to get the desired level of response. There will be a weighted analysis with respect to a variety of characteristics.

Ms. Austin-Lane posed a question about the analysis of the Ward responses.

Ms. Ludlow said there is a suggestion right now to send out different colored surveys (by Ward). If we need to up the numbers, in terms of return, we will do that.

Ms. Austin-Lane said the surveys should be coded. She hopes the firm is aware of how to do this right.

Ms. Ludlow commented on consideration of credentials of the firm. She spoke with Barbara Mathews about the survey.

Ms. Moxley had asked Ms. Ludlow about some questions, noting that she has received some

answers. She has concerns. She knows the City. She thinks that people will become suspicious when they receive a survey. You are invading the privacy of households with any type of survey. Right now, households are fighting battles with phone calls and Internet solicitations. This is not the time to do something like this. This is a waste of money. We already have a lot of this information. You should think it over again.

Ms. Porter said that staff and Council did have a discussion about whether it was worth doing a survey since we did just had an election in the Fall. She thinks that it is worth putting a small amount of money into getting statistically valid results. When we do hear from people, we most often hear from people with specific issues. Also, she is concerned that we do not hear from some groups to the extent that we hear from others. We want to get information from a broad cross-section of the residents. She does not feel that have a good sense from the groups who do not normally participate and how they feel about services and activities of the City.

Ms. Mizeur commented that this came up in a dinner conversation this evening with a friend who worked in Seattle in 1973. They set-up a goal about what they wanted the City to look like in the future. It would be interesting to hear from residents about their vision for the City in years to come (possibly, in the open ended questions).

Ms. Austin-Lane remarked that the survey seems like an important baseline if we are going to start measuring performance. It would be useless if not done right. As we go forward with the firm, we need assurances from the firm that it will be done right. We are impressed with the firm. Rockville has used them twice and has been very happy.

Mr. Williams commented on the level of detail in the Rockville survey example. It provided a wealth of information. It convinced him.

Ordinance #2004-21 was adopted unanimously (VOTING FOR: Porter, Austin-Lane, Barry, Elrich, Mizeur, Williams; ABSENT: Seamens).

**ORDINANCE #2004-21**  
**(Attached)**

**8. Resolution re: Program Open Space (POS).**

Ms. Porter noted the item. There is an allocation out of this year's money for the Sligo Mills Property acquisition. This is our annual payment back to the County for their assistance at the time we bought the property. The rest of the money will go toward the community center project.

Moved by Mr. Williams; seconded by Mr. Barry.

Ms. Moxley asked for clarification on the use of the money.

Ms. Porter explained the POS program. We have acquired a number of open space properties with this funding. Using monies for the community center does not take away from Sligo Mills or Poplar Mills.

Ms. Moxley confirmed that the Piney Branch properties were not acquired through POS.

Resolution #2004-24 was adopted unanimously (VOTING FOR: Porter, Austin-Lane, Barry, Elrich, Mizeur, Williams, ABSENT: Seamens).

**RESOLUTION #2004-24**  
**(Attached)**

**WORKSESSION**

**9. Speed Hump Request - Elm Avenue.**

Postponed until later in agenda.

**10. Agreement with MFS Telecommunications Company.**

Ms. Moffet said MFS is still an MCI WorldCom company but with a new name. MFS has had fiber throughout the City since 1999. We had been renewing this contract annually except for a couple of years when the company was going through a bankruptcy. This agreement goes back to recognize that they have been paying us since 2001. She commented on some of the provisions in the agreement. Attorney Ken Elrod worked with their lawyer to draw-up the agreement. We are still in an interim agreement. It seems the most effective way to deal with telecommunications entities coming into the City. It is working. This extends the agreement for three years. If the telecommunication policy changes, we have the option to change. At this point, there is no reason to proceed with adoption of a telecommunications ordinance. There are a lot of legal issues involved. This is working and it is not attracting complaints.

Ms. Porter said we are receiving almost \$20,000 a year for the use of our rights-of-way. We are establishing the principal that we have the right to control the right-of-way.

Ms. Mizeur asked if there was any review given to the appropriateness of the fee, given a three year extension.

Ms. Moffet said she thinks it would open up "Pandora's Box" if we were to change the \$2/foot fee. It is not a huge priority for the City. This is functioning well. She understands that the County is in the middle of three battles with companies. It is a good question to consider how things might change in three years.

Ms. Mizeur suggested the administrative fee could also be reviewed.

Ms. Moffet replied that she had the attorney review this item.

Ms. Mizeur said it seems that when we can generate revenue, when renewing things, we should look at fees. She suggests finding the threshold.

Ms. Austin-Lane commented that we could find out what other cities have in their agreements.

Ms. Moffet replied that in talking with the telecommunication attorneys on an informal basis, we were told that we should stay with the current rate. It is functional. We ought to stay under the radar. It may seem conservative, but they have seen where small communities have been sued by big companies at great time and expense. We might be able to increase the administrative fee, but she does not know whether it is worth it, all things considered.

Ms. Austin-Lane said she would hope that in three years we would be looking at a comparison of our jurisdiction to others, to ensure a competitive rate.

Mr. Elrich remarked that we should look at what other jurisdictions are getting. He is less concerned about a legal suit. It is worth the exploration.

Ms. Austin-Lane asked whether it is possible to get information from other municipalities by next Monday.

Ms. Moffet said she will try. She said she would check with the telecommunication attorneys.

Ms. Austin-Lane noted that we are including the back-date in the language. They are getting that. We should make sure that we get what we need out of the agreement.

Ms. Porter said she did not know that the back-date is worth a lot of money. Calling the attorneys is a good approach to getting the information. We would probably get a small billing from the attorney.

Ms. Austin-Lane asked whether we would get reimbursed.

Mr. Elrich proposed that since we would be trying to get information to support our decision, we would be reimbursed.

Ms. Moffet said we could try to get it reimbursed.

Mr. Williams agrees that checking with the lawyers is the way to go (versus individual calls to other jurisdictions).

Ms. Porter added her support, even if it costs a couple hundred dollars.

## **9. Speed Hump Petition - Elm Avenue.**



Ms. Waters gave a brief introduction of the item. She commented on the petition and the 79% of eligible signatures and letter of support from the South of Sligo Citizens Association (SOSCA).

Mr. Lott commented on WSSC getting around to work on this street in 2006.

Ms. Mizeur asked if this section of street was on the original list of work for this year.

Ms. Porter confirmed that it was to have been done earlier but has been delayed.

Ms. Mizeur said this road is in poor condition. Residents have asked her about the repair schedule. At a minimum, we should place the street on the list for some minor maintenance if work has been delayed until 2006.

Mr. Williams commented that this is precisely why he thinks that a speed hump should be installed now.

Ms. Porter remarked that because of the street condition it causes motorists to slow down. If repaired, they would need the speed hump. She asked for comments on her suggestion for a temporary speed hump.

Mr. Lott described the structure of a temporary speed hump. It would cost the same or more than putting in a speed hump over time. He will take a look at the roads to make them more serviceable.

Ms. Porter said she thinks that the asphalt speed hump is more logical in this case. She noted the schedule. This is the public hearing, and the first reading is next week. The second reading is in July.

**BREAK** - The Council recessed for a scheduled break.

### **11. FY04 Budget Amendment No.3.**

The items was postponed until later in the agenda.

## **12. Street Rehabilitation Loan.**

Mr. Hobbs noted two sheets distributed tonight: (1) a memo from Barbara Matthews regarding her position on the matter; and (2) a memo from Cathy about other bank quotes regarding interest rates. He noted the SunTrust rate that is up to 3.34%. In order to fix the rate as soon as possible, they could make a motion tonight for City Manager Finn to proceed with a term sheet. It does not bind us but allows us to fix the rate. Another option would be to go with a quick two-read ordinance by having a special meeting either Tuesday or Wednesday and then hold the second reading next Monday.

Mr. Elrich said he likes the first suggestion.

Mr. Hobbs reminded that it is not legally binding.

Ms. Porter commented that a term sheet is an indication that we want to go forward.

Mr. Williams remarked that the reason to go forward is the reason to do it fast.

Ms. Porter said she is a little concerned about taking a vote when we have not advertised the vote. This is an area where there is a lot of public interest. However, she thinks that there is value to doing something in order to not lose money on the interest rate.

Mr. Elrich stated that the term sheet seems to be the only way to proceed. He said he would not support having a rush first reading later this week. People deserve more time. He supports the term sheet.

Mr. Barry commented that he supports the motion to proceed with the term sheet.

Ms. Mizeur said she would also support the motion, as long as it is not perceived as a commitment. She thinks it is okay as an indicator that we are proceeding with the intention.

Ms. Porter agreed, as long as it is understood that this is locking in the rate. It is better to do public notice per a later ordinance and go ahead now, to lock-in the rate. She is concerned that we do not have numbers at this rate. Whatever is locked-in tomorrow, we need to run the scenario on those numbers. She does not think that any of the numbers are exact. There are a number of assumptions. The result of this analysis shows that borrowing money up front and doing a certain number of streets, is of value. In the end, it will cost just about the same. Cost, then, is not the issue. We are not focusing on the details of the numbers. However, she would like to see what the numbers look like. She noted the information in the package regarding the prior contractors with the vendor. The second contract cost less.

Mr. Elrich commented on the *Washington Post* article about the increasing construction costs.

Ms. Austin-Lane said she does not support proceeding with a motion.

Moved by Mr. Elrich; seconded by Mr. Barry. (NOTE: Motion to authorize the City Manager to prepare a term sheet to lock-in an interest rate (VOTING FOR: Porter, Barry, Elrich, Mizeur, Williams, VOTING AGAINST: Austin-Lane, ABSENT: Seamens).

Ms. Braithwaite stressed to the audience that this is a working document (referring to the Street Rehabilitation Schedule) and a snap shot into the future. We know generally how long it will take to get through the backlog and others in the three condition levels. It should not be read as a document stating exactly when an individual street will be done. A re-evaluation will take place each year.

Ms. Porter stated that there are some streets that might require a fairly aggressive patching.

Mr. Williams asked can we make sure that SHA be more diligent with pothole repairs on Carroll Avenue.

Ms. Braithwaite replied that in terms of the impact of the increase in the interest rate, we will see the impact in the first seven years of paying back the loan. We can also expect a 0.14% increase in the finance fees.

Mr. Elrich said this calculates to about a \$10,000 increase.

Ms. Braithwaite commented on the scenarios and the estimated increase because of the rate change. It would still be slightly less than a pay-as-you-go scenario.

Ms. Porter said she was not taking these as exact numbers—taking them as ballpark indications of how close the costs will come in. We should make the final decision based on getting more streets done earlier.

Mr. Williams remarked that he had anticipated a worsening of the bad streets without the loan factored into the appropriate scenario.

Ms. Braithwaite said that condition was a factor.

Mr. Elrich met with Ms. Braithwaite on Friday. The numbers show that it makes more sense doing something versus nothing.

Ms. Porter stated that she will have the first reading scheduled for next week. She will also have to have a discussion about the locked-in interest rate and the revised analysis.

Ms. Austin-Lane asked whether previous discussions of numbers have been reflected in the minutes.

Ms. Waters responded that we have not had requests for these specific, topic minutes. She would be happy to provide that information and/or a video of the meeting.

Ms. Mizeur said she thinks that the previous discussion was different. She cannot substitute public sentiment from one discussion to this situation (completely different “loan discussion”).

Ms. Austin-Lane replied that there is continuity. One should not ignore that testimony. She asked for back information to be made available to the new Councilmembers if they are interested. She is not presuming to know whether they are interested.

Mr. Williams remarked that he was against borrowing in a previous discussion. Through this discussion, he has changed his position. For those who come to comment on this ordinance, we should make it clear to them that this is a different discussion and a different result. We have more information, and the scenario has changed.

Ms. Porter said she wants packets with information for the public next week.

Mr. Elrich stated that in the previous discussion, we did not have a street study. That was one of the greatest public concerns. We came up with a different analysis through the study. Those who commented in the first discussion had impact on how we proceeded.

Ms. Porter reminded that the other thing that changed is that we were talking about a \$4M, \$6M or \$8M loan. Now we are talking about the lower end of the scale--\$2M. Doing the worst of the worse on a loan basis. We talked about the fact that it might make sense to borrow a small amount of money for a short-term loan. We have since done an extensive analysis. Numbers show that it is not really an issue of cost. It seems more an issue of how we do the work and on what schedule. This has been part of her decision.

Ms. Mizeur asked if she agrees with the characterization of the differences (in response to Ms. Austin-Lane’s comment).

Ms. Austin-Lane replied. There are some common elements. The issue of borrowing money, need to hire additional staff to oversee the work, inflation, etc. If construction inflation is going to go up as predicted, then it is a wash. Paying over 3% for interest on a loan is a penalty. She thinks that some people will again repeat previous issues.

Ms. Porter said that one thing we have done is to be more and more clear. There has been a process of refining our analysis and the estimates. We have a lot of detail. We have a better handle on the cost and comparisons over time. We are much more comfortable. She thinks that it has been very useful to have this discussion over the past two years. We have gotten to a lot better position to make the decision.

Ms. Braithwaite commented that in terms of additional staffing, it will not be required. The engineer will oversee the project. One recommendation will be to continue the practice of having an inspector on site. Those costs are factored into the costs of the streets.

Ms. Austin-Lane agreed that we are in better shape because of the study, but a question has been

raised about whether that is helping us do a better job on streets that we are addressing now. Are there surprises?

Ms. Braithwaite said there are, at times. What we have not had in the past is the scientific assumption found through core borings. She described some of the situations that are discovered.

Ms. Austin-Lane added that we are finding that some of the issues that took place in Ms. Mizeur's Ward are continuing (e.g., water issues, sub-pump outlets paved over, etc.).

Mr. Lott remarked that there are some small things that we go back and work out. The contractor is required to go back and make the corrections.

Ms. Porter said there have also been reports of sink holes caused by water.

Ms. Braithwaite commented that we have learned a lot. This was the contractor's first time doing a 6 inch milling. The work cycle is now better managed.

Ms. Mizeur asked why they did not have experience doing a 6 inch milling.

Ms. Braithwaite replied that she thinks that they are usually dealing with roads in better conditions, requiring only a 2-3 inch mill.

Ms. Mizeur questioned if the numbers and calculations would change if we were to change contractors.

Ms. Braithwaite said we have numbers in the street study which have some inflationary items built-in. For the streets outside of those given a dollar figure in the street study, they are factored on an inflationary rate for 8 years and out. We have spent \$500,000 on street work since March. It is costing us less than what was in the street study. She encouraged Council to visit Kirkland Avenue.

Mr. Lott added that work has been done as professionally as possible, using EBA and their inspectors to validate that the contractor is doing work according to standards.

Mr. Elrich remarked that everyone has problems with contractors. Only when you get into the work on a street do you find all of the aspects that need to be addressed. In the future, we will have City records that are very detailed. We have a diagram for about everything that is taking place on a street.

Mr. Williams said we need to secure the records for the future.

Mr. Elrich commented about the work on sub-basins.

Ms. Braithwaite stated that in cases where we are doing total reconstruction, where we have a street that has such a poor surface coat that we cannot build onto it, we need to get to work before the surface coat becomes so poor. She hopes that the streets that are in good and excellent condition, will be addressed in an amount of time that can use a portion of the surface coat as part of the base. Hopefully, we will not have to do the total reconstruction to the extent as now, particularly, as we get out further in the years.

Ms. Austin-Lane asked is there anything in the Newsletter about this discussion.

Mr. Hobbs said he can get something in the Newsletter.

Ms. Austin-Lane said it would be helpful to have a clear presentation of the information.

Ms. Porter expressed thanks for all of the work, especially that of Ms. Braithwaite.

**11. FY04 Budget Amendment No.3 (previously moved in the order of the agenda).**

Ms. Waters explained the amendment.

Ms. Porter clarified the adoption schedule.

Mr. Williams asked how long the books are left open after the end of the fiscal year.

Ms. Waters explained that it is generally 30 days.

**ADJOURNMENT / CLOSED SESSION**

The Council adjourned at 9:56 p.m. and convened in Closed Session. Following the Closed Session, the Council adjourned for the evening.

---

Closed Session 6/14/04 - Motion by Austin-Lane; seconded by Barry. The Council voted to convene in Closed Session at 9:56 p.m. in the Municipal Building Conference Room to discuss a personnel matter (VOTING FOR: Porter, Austin-Lane, Barry, Elrich, Mizeur, Williams; ABSENT: Seamens). OFFICIALS PRESENT: Porter, Austin-Lane, Barry, Elrich, Mizeur, Williams; STAFF/OTHERS PRESENT: Silber, Waters. Council discussed the terms of the contract for the new City Manager and provided direction to the City Attorney. (Authority: Annotated Code of Maryland, State Government Article, Section 10-508(a)(1)(i))

---